

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reexamination of the captioned application is respectfully requested.

A. SUMMARY OF THIS AMENDMENT

By the current amendment, Applicants basically:

1. Amend independent claims 1, 19, 35, 36, 47, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61 and 62.
2. Respectfully traverse all prior art rejections.
3. Petition for a Three Month Extension of Time.

B. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-15, 17-19, 22, 23, 25, 31-33, 35-37, 39-43, 47, 49 and 50 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al. Claims 16, 28 and 34 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al. Claims 21, 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,397,882 to Van Solt. Claims 16, 28 and 34 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,696,366 to Ziarno. Claims 29, 30, 44-46 and 48 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,640,214 to Nambudiri et al. All prior art rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The final office action mailed on November 4, 2006 was virtually identical to the previous office action of April 5, 2006. As such, the November 4, 2006 Final

Office Action did not apprise Applicants whether the Examiner had appreciated and fully considered the claim amendments implemented by the September 5, 2006 amendment. The September 5, 2006 claim amendments introduced the word “all” to specify that all the cradles are housed in a same and single substantially flat portion of the housing.

Nothing in the November 4, 2006 Final Office Action indicated that the Examiner appreciated the September 5, 2006 claim amendment. Moreover, no wherein the November 4, 2006 Final Office Action did the Examiner explain how the newly amended claims were met by any applied reference. Specifically, the November 4, 2006 Final Office Action failed to fairly identify any portion of a prior art reference that discloses compartments of a dispenser which are all housed in a flat portion of the housing for terminals. Applicants thus feel that the November 4, 2006 Final Office Action was incomplete and deficient.

Applicants now urge the Examiner to consider carefully the September 5, 2006 claim amendments as carried forth in the claims now present, and to fully consider Applicants’ September 5, 2006 patentability arguments. Applicants believe that due consideration will result in a favorable finding of patentability. But if the claims are not found patentable, Applicants request a clear statement of reasons for rejection with citations to prior art document(s) to explain fully how the claims are rendered unpatentable, particularly in view of the “all” limitation.

C. MISCELLANEOUS

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /H. Warren Burnam, Jr./

H. Warren Burnam, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsh
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100